BERKELEY, CALIF. MWF

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

The American Friend

Old Series Vol. L No. 22 | NOVEMBER 4, 1943 | New Series Vol. XXXI No. 22

Indiana Yearly Meeting Resolutions

A Symposium By

Lowell D. Cox
Merle L. Davis
William C. Dennis
Murray S. Kenworthy
Donald McKinney
Floyd Schmoe
Percy M. Thomas

Moving Toward One World

By Harrop A. Freeman

A Modern Tower of Babel

By A. J. Muste

Saving Europe's Starving Children

By Howard E. Kerschner

It Was Only an Armistice

An Editorial

The Sunday School Lesson in the Business of Living

Provided by the Board on Christian Education—Edited by Percy M. Thomas

November 14—Christian Ideals of Love and Marriage

(Exodus 20:14; Matthew 5:27-30; Mark 10:2-12)

THE SANCTITY OF THE HOME

Perhaps the greatest need with regard to the marriage relationship is that it be lifted out of the category of convenience to the high plane of Christian vocation. There are two aspects of the marriage of convenience to which we wish to call your attention. The first is the use of marriage as a legal sanction for sex relationship. The second is the convenience of marriage in furthering the selfish interests of adults.

Sex has its rightful place in the ideal marriage relationship. The attractiveness of one for the other is a God-given instinct; but the home goes on the rocks if the marriage becomes merely the convenient arrangement for the gratification of the sex urge. That which will lift this relationship out of this low plane and sanctify it, is the purifying of the love of the two by the ideal of marriage suggested in the phrase "they two shall become one;" and the further attitude expressed in the philosophy based on this truth, "there is that of God in every man." Thus viewed all personality becomes sacred and that sacredness will not be violated by unwholesome sex ideals.

The other convenience is brought about by the natural sequence of events in the life of a normal individual. He has passed from youth into manhood and has perhaps launched out on his chosen career. The convenient thing for him to do is to marry. The success of his job may depend somewhat upon his having a home; a place in which to entertain friends; a place where he may find recreation from his labors. All this is laudable, but if such marriage becomes solely a matter of convenience, then the home becomes a place where he boards and sleeps.

In these homes when children come they are frequently unwanted. If this be the case then little preparation has been made for more than their proper physical care. Frequently no planning is done to create an environment suitable to the Christian nurture of such children. Our feeling is that we are not here dealing with just an isolated example of this type of convenience for it is our conviction that many homes fall within this classification. How else can we explain the fact that thousands of children grow up without any conscious effort having been made to do more for them than give them physical care, and at the proper time comply with the laws of the land relative to their education? Such homes have not been planned with this basic function of the home in mind. Our homes are very largely adult homes. They are planned for the convenience of adults. The head of the family must advance in his chosen field of endeavor and the mother and father must take their places in the social life of the community.

The making of a home should be a Christian vocation. Young people should enter the marriage relationship with the idea that they are starting out on a great cooperative venture. The marriage is a "form of union of two lovers who think of God as the giver of the love which binds them together . . . It is a high partnership in which they are responsible to each other and to God." This quotation from the pamphlet on *Safeguarding Marriage* put out by the Federal Council contains a thought that must be considered in purifying the motives in marriage. If the two lovers think of God as the giver of that love which attracts them to each other, they are not very apt to desecrate that love.

The other thought in this quotation is that marriage is a "high partnership." It is a partnership not alone of the two but in turn their partnership with God. The family is the basic social unit. Here they enter into a partnership with God in the great enterprise of creating a Christian society. Christian ideals must be fostered in the home or we will never realize them in society. Here children must receive their basic religious training. No amount of formal religious training in the church and school can ever make up for the lack of Christian nurture in the home. If the principles of Christian democracy are to be worked out in society they will spring from the basic unit of society, the home.

The Protestant church is failing at this point in her program of Christian education. It is true that strides have been made in the Federal Council in the material prepared along this line. Our own Five Years Meeting has a well organized department dealing with the problem of Christian Home life. Our failure comes down to our local meetings and churches. We have not worked out effective means of getting these ideas across to the ones most vitally concerned; those who are now approaching marriage and the establishment of homes. Perhaps our Christian Education Committees in our local meetings should have departments on Christian Home life with definite programs of education in the youth classes; with specific training carried on with the newly married young people.

Marriage is an entrance into a great vocation. These questions are for consideration: How may the marriage relationship be made Christian? How may we emphasize the importance of the home in making a Christian society? How shall we prepare for the suitable Christian nurture of children in the home?

NORVAL WEBB.

For November 21—The Christian Standard of Honesty

(Exodus 20:15; Leviticus 19:11, 13; Luke 19:1-10, 45, 46)

*FIGS OR THISTLES?

A noted British author, Israel Zangwill, once put into a sentence the most devastating heresy which has ever cursed the world. "Morality is made for man; not man for morality." In other words, the thing is optional and relative. Christian principles are all very well for children in Sunday school. But when it comes to matters such as international politics, well—then we've got to be practical. It is our major assumption that nothing will work if it is generous and fine and morally good stuff. Force and greed and selfishness are "realistic" and therefore necessary in determining policy. Wallace and Willkie are full of "globaloney," and the practical man is never a Wilson, but a Clemenceau. So the standards are down—out in the real world—and expediency becomes the only rule. "You can't govern Ireland," said Lord Birkenhead, "according to the Sermon on the Mount."

I wonder! Fourteen civilizations to date have followed in each case the realistic procedures—and they are as dead as a door nail. I walked over their ruins one summer and meditated on the folly of trying to win security by using a big stick. Or consider this record: Not so long ago, *practical* politics produced a war. It cost about 300 billions of dollars, 23 million dead soldiers and civilians, 20 million casualties, 3 million unaccounted for, 1 million

(Continued on page 447)

*Secured from the *International Journal of Religious Education.*

THE AMERICAN FRIEND

Authorized by The Five Years Meeting of Friends in America

ERROL T. ELLIOTT
Editor

Published Fortnightly at 101 So. Eighth St., Richmond, Indiana
Subscription Price—$1.50 per Year

Old Series Vol. L No. 22 | NOVEMBER 4, 1943 | New Series Vol. XXXI No. 22

Entered as second-class matter, March 23, 1918, at the post office at Richmond, Indiana, under the act of March 3, 1897

It Was Only An Armistice!

An Editorial

"EXACTLY a quarter of a century has passed since an armistice halted the "war to end war." Now the memory of that day will be all but submerged beneath the torrents of another war, for the prevention of which, the first one was fought. It has become a commonplace to point out the dwindling democracy left after that war "to make the world safe for democracy."

The announced motives for this present conflict are different only in phrasing from those which twenty-five years of time have mocked. "To make the world safe for freedom" might well be the revised text under which, as nations, we heap war upon war—mistake upon mistake—into one colossal ruin. As we had less democracy after the first war we might ask how much freedom there will be twenty-five years from now. What will the balance sheet then reveal? We shall not need to wait long to witness the formation of that year. In five years we shall see more clearly what is happening to freedom.

When Are We Free?

Just as we lacked an adequate concept of democracy then, so we lack an ideology for freedom now. We shall either find and apply it or else continue a succession of armistices after a series of world wars. Recently the story was told of a man standing on dry eroded land where he had lived for some years as a tenant. Nearby was his house which added physical evidence of his inability to make an ordinary living during years of hard labor. As the conversation drifted toward the present war he cursed roundly the enslavers of Europe who had the sinister design of "destroying our freedom in America."

One might equally deplore the designs of enslavers and yet see the pitiful spectacle of this man with very little freedom to lose standing ready to die for freedom. It is doubly ironic when slaves die to preserve their "liberties." But our aim in this story is not to become glib about the issues in the present conflict. It is not so simple as that, but we ought to see more deeply and closely the issues of war which lie in our backyards of America. If we do not see this problem for all men, then it will again be armistice and not peace for another generation.

This defeated tenant points up that picture. He doubtless had some vestige of freedom which was worth defending in some proper way, but his position should shock us out of any easy phrases under which millions are asked to die. The right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" is an unfulfilled duty to be sure, but more, it is an unrecognized *responsibility*. The unwitting slavery in which all nations have held "backward" countries and isles of the sea will lead us again and again to those same islands as stepping stones in a new "defense of freedom."

Those isles wait for the word of God made incarnate in our understanding and behavior. Until we give freedom in terms of higher levels of living economically and spiritually we shall finally have none for ourselves. Freedom enters where our sense of responsibility begins. Unresponsible people can never be free. Such people will always end a war with nothing more effective than an armistice. We have yet to really write a peace for the world.

Freedom Unlimited?

Nor do we settle accounts with this problem by tackling it only upon the national level. There is adequate evidence for the need of world dimension in all peace planning. Our wars are emphasizing that. All major wars are now *world* wars. In fact we are running out of distinguishing names and give them numbers instead. The clock of time has already tolled the *second* death struggle in one generation.

The only alternative to World War is world freedom and opportunity. Whatever agreements we may patch up they will not spell peace if they do not go with remedial measures up into the tributaries of economics, race and nationalism out of which wars accumulate. It is ridiculous to think that a Caucasian empire designed for Caucasians chiefly can endure. Nor is the "great Asia" adequate as a concept for permanent peace in the East. With whatever area adjustments and administrations we order the world of tomorrow the larger ideology must not be lacking at the peril of the next generation.

Strangely enough we may readily assent to the geographical dimension in general and disavow it when it reaches the halls of congress and calls for national legislation that means economic sharing. We are ready for world order so long as it doesn't cost us anything. If it lowers the price of farm products, the size of salaries or increases the imports of competitive goods we revert to type and ask for "protection" from other nations which have different living standards. Worse yet, all of this makes good political brew by which the "outs" (either party) who want "in" feed us the platitudes of selfishness. The nationalistic "holy words" lead us again into isolation and from freedom. It is not far from true to say that we can have peace whenever we are ready to pay for it. It may cost us *now* but the future will pay adequate dividends.

E. T. E.

Moving Toward One World

By Harrop A. Freeman

If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it.—ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

TOUCH where you will current literature, seemingly contradictory newspaper reports, world observers' commentaries. What are they all saying? Anne Morrow Lindbergh was one of the first to emphasize the keen desire of the common people to redefine the rules by which they live—*The Wave of the Future*—on which the strife and violence and "isms" might be only the scum. Raoul de Roussey de Sales* has interpreted this war as not merely a vertical conflict between nations but as a horizontal conflict—ideological, political, social, economic in which there are three great forces at work: *nationalism, collectivism, pacifism.* Alexander Mieklejohn**, as an educator completely disavowing the religious approach, finds the driving forces of our time to be: brotherhood, "appeal to reason" compared to "resort to violence," kindness or intelligence, and the principle of losing one's life in service to the whole in order to find that life.

Translate these observations and currents over into two of the specific issues which must be faced: the spiritual basis of world order and the mechanics of world order.

UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD

It is written so bold that all, who run may read: the "white man's burden" is being laid at rest, forcibly in some places, by agreement in some, by non-violent action in others. Politically and economically, more rapidly perhaps than socially, is being driven home the conclusion that this is *One World.* And though this principal will meet long and stubborn opposition, I am certain it is coming in and cannot be defeated. Internally between labor and capital, between Negro and white, between social and financial strata, the barriers are being and will be broken. Internationally between colored and white, colony and empire, have and have-nots, the walls are being and will be laid low.

Originally Jesus' conception was of a kingdom "not of this world"—a Christian community which would exist alongside the temporal state and finally by proved excellence replace it. In mid-passage the Christian church and the state struck a bargain—a dichotomy in which the church should be supreme in its field of morals and the state should be free in its field of law. The world developed a case of schizophrenia: on the one side man was encouraged to seize, acquire, hold, overcome and his "interests" were protected by force and violence. On the other hand he was taught to love, share, seek the good of others and avoid the use of force. Inevitably came illness.

Today, the world over, we are using force with a sorry heart; we are protecting "things" with lives and asking whether it is worth it. We are, I believe, moving into the third stage of the relation of religion and the state, wherein religion recognizes that both the church and the state are organizations through which religion can be expressed. And to a remarkable degree in social legislation, in women's rights, in many other fields the state has become religious; more religious perhaps than the church. It is in the remaining fields of international relations and economics that religion is demanding that the state express universal brotherhood.

NON-COERCIVE ORGANIZATION

One keen observer has pointed out that all wars are essentially "civil wars" and never occur until people have agreed upon association, the war being for the purpose of determining who shall control the major principles of association. Everywhere today it is assumed that we shall have some form of world organization. What are the great issues? They are, I believe, three in number as they have been in all attempts to organize society into larger units. *First,* where does sovereignty reside? *Second,* what shall be the place of force? *Third,* can the necessary adjustments and compromises be effected to permit of different economic systems, different political theories, different size groupings of people to work together in the larger unit?

First: Where Does Sovereignty Reside? In the short space at my command I can no more than sketch rough outlines. The word "sovereignty" was coined in 1577 by Jean Bodin to justfy the policy of the French monarch—supreme power unrestrained by law. That policy in national affairs met popular opposition and gave rise to the Bills of Rights, to the French and American revolutions, to the declaration of "inalienable rights" of men. No longer was the "king" to be sovereign; sovereignty rested in the mass of common men. But strangely enough the exponents of sovereignty merely transferred their efforts to the international sphere. Here the state became sovereign, that is, above the law. States could seize land by force and international law would approve; could debar lesser states from a voice in the family of nations and international law recognized this status; reserve "national honor and vital interests" from international adjudication and international law would not interfere; wage war with legal "sanction."

Finally the common man has begun to realize that limitations on internal sovereignty in the form of consti-

**The Making of Tomorrow,* 1942.
***Education Between Two Worlds,* Harpers, 1942.

tutional protection of freedom of speech, the press, religion, and the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness have relatively little value to him if, under the necessities of war and the other outcomes of international sovereignty he is deprived of these protections by conscription, censorship, taxation and governmental control. There is a growing demand everywhere that national sovereignty must be subordinated to a universal world order responsible to all people, in whom ultimately reside sovereignty.

Force Versus Reason

Second: What Shall Be The Place of Force? Most people assume that law in general is to be defined as "edict plus sanction or coercion." That is a very partial view of law and represents only one school of jurisprudence. There are equally sound scholars who insist that law is the recognized customs and mores of the people backed up by public opinion. Still others consider that law is "natural," that is the rules woven into the universe and into man's fiber by God. Certainly no one school contains all the truth. Force may be useful to restrain an individual until reason and rehabilitation can be brought to bear; it cannot replace reason. Force cannot enforce that which is out of harmony with the times whether it is a "prohibition amendment" or a "status quo" of nations. Eventually all law, internal and international must rest on popular acceptance.

But more important than the issue of the use of force against individuals is the problem of its use against nations or groups of persons. History is replete with evidence that no international organization can coerce member states and retain unity. Let me merely review some of the evidence. In this country after the fullest of debates the plan to give the federal government power to coerce a state was rejected as "the maddest project that was ever devised." Historians agree that in every attempt at Federation in the world the principle of coercion of member states was either rejected or where attempted proved disruptive of union. The United States rejected membership in the League of Nations because Articles X and XVI provided for collective coercion; Switzerland refused to be bound by these provisions; by 1924 they became meaningless and when the idea of collective security was again raised by the Geneva and Locarno Protocols it was rejected by the British Dominions and then by the Oslo group.

The League was presented with not less than ten applications for the use of Articles X and XVI and failed to use them. The Pan-American Union has, no less than six times, rejected proposals for defining the aggressor nation and applying collective coercion. The ties to the mother country are weak or completely broken in the British Empire controlled by coercion. They are surprisingly strong and unimpaired in the Dominions which are "subject to no compulsion whatever."* Neither the United States Supreme Court nor the Hague Tribunal has power to enforce its decisions against states yet the decisions have been obeyed. Even the American Civil War, which is so often cited to prove the necessity of coercing member states that the "union might be preserved," fails to show the efficacy of coercion. Modern interpretation brands it as a political blunder which retarded rather than fostered unification.** In the 1860's in Brazil the same issue between "slave" and "non-slave" states arose; the method of coercion was rejected, moderation and compromise were attempted. It was 1888 before all slaves were emancipated but no fissure either politically or racially developed as in the United States. Canada faced the issue of secession and in the election of 1896 definitely rejected the principle of coercion—yet Canada held together.

The Fulbright resolution, the current agitation for "enforcement of peace," the movement for "collective security" are the most dangerous propaganda now abroad. More dangerous are they than appeals to hate, for they seek to direct the great desire of the people for peace into channels which can only promise bigger and better wars.

Toward One World

Third: Can The Necessary Adjustments and Compromises be Effected? Whenever groups of men attempt to come together into larger units they bring with them certain vestiges of institutions which may have served in the smaller grouping yet may cause conflicts in the larger association. In the formation of our country we compromised the conflicts between large and small states, between industrial and agrarian. To a lesser degree were we able to settle the problem of slavery and states' rights. It was in these latter fields where compromise and adjustment were not carried to final agreement that the evolution toward unity broke down after seventy-five years.

Without space to elaborate I shall mention the three fields requiring international adjustment: (1) How combine economically when communism and capitalism exist in different states, (2) How foster cooperation between governments, one democratic, one authoritarian, (3) How provide for equality in inequality—the small compared to the large power, the backward compared to the advanced state.

Finally I see the necessity for peace now. All treaties of peace are "negotiated." Victory will at the most mean a preponderance in the negotiations and an ability to force acceptance of our demands, whether they appeal to reason or not. If order depends ultimately upon acceptance, "dictation" places order farther in the background. I hold no brief for a particular type of world organization. The spirit and function are more important than the form. I believe I see the spirit emerging; even in war we notice the functions of cooperation being carried on. It seems to me that we are more likely to see world order through separate commissions immediately following the war—one to care for feeding, another for trade, another for refugees—rather than a full blown federation or world state. But again I say, the spirit and function are important, not the form.

"To resort to force is to lose faith in the inner light. War only results from men taking counsel with their passions instead of waiting upon God. If one believes, as Fox did, that the most powerful element in human nature is that something of God which speaks in the conscience, then to coerce men is clearly wrong. The only true line of approach is by patience to reach down to that divine seed, to appeal to what is best, because it is what is strongest in man. The Quaker testimony against war is no isolated outwork of their position: it forms part of their citadel."

H. G. Wood.

From *A Book of Quaker Saints* by L. V. Hodgkin.

*Balfour Report, 1926.

**James Garfield Randall, *The Civil War and Reconstruction;* Svery Craven, *The Coming of the Civil War;* Paul Buck, *The Road to Reunion.*

A Modern Tower of Babel

By A. J. Muste

WHEN Secretary of State Hull in September made a major pronouncement on American foreign policy, he made really only one statement that was at once definite and not a repetition of what had been said many times before. It was to the effect that the United States should participate and, so far as the Roosevelt administration was able to determine, would participate with other nations in maintaining the peace against aggressors in the post-war world by armed force. In suggesting that in an international order or any form of world government you must have some form of force that can be used against offending nations, he was undoubtedly speaking the mind of the majority of his fellow-citizens, including a number of pacifists. I firmly believe, nevertheless, that the idea is deceptive, unsound and dangerous.

In the first place, the fundamental approach here taken is wrong. The people who take it are primarily concerned about how to restore peace by force, that is, by war when war threatens or has broken out, rather than about removing the causes of war and thus preventing it. A few years ago, Henry Noel Brailsford, the brilliant English publicist and authority on international affairs, commenting upon the experiences of Europe from 1919 to 1939 in a single sentence as vivid as a flash of lightning, revealed the futility and fallacy of the peace by force position: "Not all the guns and battleships in creation, no, not if Geneva (the League of Nations) had controlled them all, would have sufficed to keep the peace so long as the economic inequity and anarchy of the last twenty years continued."

Create a fundamentally sound economic situation by doing something, for example, about the fact that at the beginning of the war the so-called democratic nations and their satellites controlled thirty million square miles of the earth's territory, whereas a group of nations including Germany, Japan, Italy, etc., controlled one million—and all peoples will have an interest in maintaining this mutually beneficial arrangement; no people will need to be restrained by force from acting to perpetuate their own well-being. Fail to remove such causes of war and Brailsford has told you how much an "international police" (read "army") will be good for.

Will Force Maintain Peace?

The peace by force advocates, perhaps unconsciously think of a status quo which must be maintained, by force if necessary. But that is just what we must avoid. In a constantly and swiftly changing world we need arrangements by which adjustments can be made among the nations, not a powerful force to prevent the forces that would seek to effect change from doing so gradually and peacefully. John Foster Dulles demonstrated this thesis adequately in his book *War, Peace and Change* which all who are interested in the subject under discussion ought to read again. Against any kind of "force system" he advocated "such elasticity in the treaty structure of the world as would avoid rigidities which cannot but be broken by the inexorable requirements of change."

In one way or another the advocates of peace by force usually betray the fact that they have in mind the maintenance of a system which is advantageous to the nations to which they happen to belong and that they themselves do not trust the "international police" arrangements which they advocate. Mr. Hull had not a word to say in the address referred to about disarmament or even reduction of armament by the United States or any other nation, except of course the Axis powers. Mr. Culbertson's ingenious plan is so arranged, he told me, that even if the "collective security" arrangements fail to work, the United States will be equipped to take care of herself if war should break out! If what is meant by an international police force in such discussions, is joint action by armies of some sovereign states (such as Great Britain, Russia, and the United States) in a world where other nations are disarmed or too small to count in a military sense, we obviously have a dictatorship of some nations over others. There is surely no more reason now than in the past to suppose that this means justice or peace. Furthermore, to be realistic, why should we think these victorious nations will not fall out among themselves as in the past?

On the other hand, if nations generally scrap their independent military establishments, then what need is there of a formidable international army to keep the peace among them? If men are thinking of a huge world state having the monopoly of armed force and possessed of a great deal of it, I submit that such force could only be used against the citizens of the world-state in order to suppress any effort to social change which these citizens might make. Such an armed force would be the instrument of the most all-embracing, inescapable, and totalitarianism the world has ever known. It would be the modern attempt to build a Babel tower reaching to heaven!

Individuals Must Be Tried

There is one kind of international police force which would not be subject to the criticisms we have been making. It would be a police force in the proper sense of that term, which could go into any nation and arrest individuals as the federal police in this country can go into any state and arrest those charged with violating federal laws. Thus individuals and corporations might be brought before international courts. Whatever criticism may be leveled from a pacifist standpoint against any use of police force can of course be applied to such an international police; but in any case the latter would be on an entirely different footing from an international army operating against nations, political entities, rather than individuals.

This vital distinction was drawn by the Founding Fathers of this nation in the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Two proposals to "enforce peace" on the states were before that convention. They would have provided for calling forth "the force of the Union against any member of the Union failing to do its duty under the Articles thereof." James Madison "observed that the more he reflected upon the use of force, the more he doubted the practicability, the justice and the efficiency of it when applied to people collectively, and not individually. The use of force against a State would look more like a declaration of war, than an infliction of punishment, and would probably be considered by the party attacked as a dissolution of all previous compacts by which it might be bound." There we have it: the use of force against a state or nation means war.

But what about the Civil War, some ask? As the very use of the phrase "civil war" suggests, it bore out the thesis of the Founding Fathers. When a fundamental

economic issue was left unsolved, the Union which had been founded on mutual interest, on the universal elimination of tariff barriers, for example, fell apart and there was war—just as there will be under similar circumstances under a world-government, until men learn a better way than war. In the hysteria following the Civil War "force bills" were tried against the Southern States. They were abandoned before long. Even so, our nation is still reaping the bitter fruits of the Reconstruction Period. Would anyone want to revive that peace by force regime in this country? Why suppose it can be made to work in the world?

A masterly and indispensable pamphlet recently issued by the Pacifist Research Bureau, 1201 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, and entitled "Coercion of States In Federal Unions" demonstrates that every successful democratic union of states or nations in the world—the British Commonwealth, Australia, the Union of South Africa, Canada, Switzerland, the United States—is built on the rejection, as Professor L. P. Jacks puts it, of the principle of "a *coercive* union of states endowed with the right to make war on one or any of its members" and the acceptance instead of the principle of "*non-coercive* Leagues of Nations" which look to "more profitable forms of cooperation, with a view of reducing the likelihood that nations will want to fight."

CHRISTMAS GIFTS FOR TENNESSEE

The need for Christmas remembrances for the boys and girls in our mission stations in Tennessee is as great as ever. Our workers there write as follows:

"All kinds of good used clothing can be used. We ran out of coats and sweaters for boys last year. Baby clothes are always in demand; we have calls for them throughout the whole year.

"We would like to stress the fact that we need more toys, new and used, to make Christmas a little brighter for our large number of boys and girls."

These gifts should be sent as early in December as possible. Mail them to:

J. Edward Ransome
Star route
Belltown, Tennessee

or to

Edward C. Linton
Tellico Plains, R. R., Tennessee.

"Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

TAXES AND BENEVOLENCES

Neither the church nor the general public has yet paused to realize the influence which the new revenue act, requiring current payment of income taxes at source, may have upon the future of all privately supported philanthropy. Leaders urge the importance of prompt expressions of active interest if the needs of church and charity are to be considered in pending tax legislation.

National income during the past fifteen years has increased fifty-five per cent and, during this period income tax has spiraled upward, but concurrent with this increased taxation, gifts to religious bodies have decreased until last year thirty-three per cent less per capita was given to church and related charities than was given ten years ago when the country was in the midst of the great depression. This decrease has been in spite of the fact that the average per capita income today is more than double that of ten years ago, and people of today are living in the midst of the greatest need for pure religion and ministries of mercy that this world has ever known. The total expenditures for officially recognized luxuries, at a time when millions are suffering for lack of the necessities of life, are at least twenty times as much as the total gifts for churches, war relief and all privately supported philanthropy. Should it not be possible for the average church member to give during the unprecedentedly prosperous period of 1943 at least as large a percentage of his income as he gave during the depression of 1932?

Congressman Carl T. Curtis (Nebraska) appeared October 7 to introduce before The Committee on Ways and Means an amendment to permit an employer, at the request of an employee, to deduct the average amount of contributions the employee certifies he will pay during the current year, before withholding the tax each payroll period. Contributions to charity are tax exempt and should not be taxed at source or at any later time.

Will you not write your senators and representatives asking for their personal cooperation when the bill comes before the House and the Senate?

THE GOLDEN RULE FOUNDATION.

ADDITIONAL COPIES

It is suggested that those who desire additional copies of this, and ensuing issues of THE AMERICAN FRIEND place their order immediately upon receiving the magazine. Study groups may be interested in the material contained in this issue, and copies may be had in any amount if ordered before the printing forms are torn down. Individual copies are ten cents each.

A.F.S.C. HOSPITAL UNIT AT WHITTIER, CALIFORNIA

Because there is a shortage of graduate nurses, most hospitals are now using untrained women for much of the simpler nursing work. This makes it possible for a young woman to learn under good supervision the ordinary procedures for the bed care of the sick without going through the more elaborate studies and training of the nurses' training course.

It is hoped to develop a unit made up of from ten to fifteen young women at the Murphy Memorial Hospital in Whittier, California. They will be paid 35 cents per hour and will be required to work eight hours per day five days per week, with the possibility of an increase in pay after three months. In addition to the experience in the care of the sick, there would be the opportunity for training and practical experience under a competent dietician in the hospital kitchen.

The group could, in the evening and week-end time, develop a study program along lines of public health, sanitation, relief, and reconstruction work. Some particular area could be selected for the study of its language, history, politics, social customs and needs. It is possible that college credit may be arranged for this study. The period should be for six months to a year. Living can be arranged at the hospital, or a cooperative house might be arranged. This unit is sponsored by the American Friends Service Committee and should be especially useful to those who are looking forward to openings for services of relief and reconstruction, which it is hoped will occur later.

Applications and inquiries should be addressed to Dr. W. C. Bruff, 238 North Greenleaf Avenue, Whittier, California. Personal interviews will be required by the hospital authorities before employment can be assured.

We must not be mere spectators in an hour whose first great demand is action.

Indiana Yearly Meeting Resolutions

A Symposium

Editorial Note: We have arranged here a group of articles which have come to us in regard to the much publicized Indiana Yearly Meeting Resolution. A deep desire to bring peace to a troubled world is evidenced here. The sincere conviction and fine spirit in which the writers have expressed their differing views as to how this is to be brought about, we trust will engender equally sincere and prayerful thinking on the part of the readers of THE AMERICAN FRIEND, *and thus promote the cause of peace.*

WAS OUR PEACE TESTIMONY REAFFIRMED OR DENIED?

BY PERCY M. THOMAS

"Use of force in maintaining of Peace approved by Friends." Such was the headline with a two column spread that greeted the readers of the Richmond, Indiana, *Palladium-Item* on Sunday morning, September 26.

On the Wednesday evening before, President Dennis of Earlham College presented to Indiana Yearly Meeting a resolution placing Friends "on record as rejoicing in the study of plans for the establishment and maintenance of peace through justice founded on law by men of good will all over the world; and in particular it desires to commend the concerned spirit and the general method of approach to these all-important questions exemplified by Herbert Hoover, a member of the Society of Friends, and Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States in his radio address of September 12." The resolution also expressed its gratification at the action of the United States House of Representatives in passing the Fulbright Resolution which commits the United States "as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace."

After a few minutes of discussion the proposition was made and approved that the matter be deferred to a later session, giving Friends an opportunity to study the resolution more carefully. The matter was brought forward again on Friday afternoon and the meeting was unable to arrive at any unity of action. At this time a committee of five was appointed to meet with President Dennis in an attempt to prepare a resolution that might be more nearly acceptable to all Friends. The persons named on the committee were Percy M. Thomas, Murray S. Kenworthy, Jesse A. Stanfield, Myron Tripp, and Lowell D. Cox. When the committee met it soon became apparent that they could not amend the resolution so that it would be satisfactory to all; the difference of opinion being at one point only: Should Friends approve of the use of military force as a method to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace?

On Saturday the resolution as amended was submitted by the committee, having the support of three members with two members dissenting.

After a discussion which was brief because of the press of other business, the resolution was approved. There was a considerable number of Friends who expressed themselves as opposed to the resolution.

The passing of this resolution calls for the consideration of some serious questions:

In giving approval to this resolution have Indiana Friends denied their ancient peace testimony?

Can Friends hold to the ways of love and conciliation and at the same time affirm that the Fulbright resolution which allows for the use of force is a "step forward?"

Is the expression of the belief that the Fulbright resolution is a step forward tantamount to approving of force?

Is the Fulbright resolution, since it is based on force, really a step forward? Even if the Fulbright resolution were conceded to be a step forward, should Friends pass resolutions approving steps which do not express their ideals?

Should Friends who feel that the Fulbright resolution is a "step forward" be willing to serve in a police army if that is considered to be the "power adequate to establish and maintain peace?"

On Saturday evening the Young

— THE RESOLUTION —

PREAMBLE

Both as citizens of the United States and as members of the Society of Friends, we are deeply concerned in the terms of peace and in the post-war settlement. The acid test of any provision which it is proposed to insert in the peace terms is whether or not it is conducive to a just and lasting peace. William Penn said in 1693, "Peace is maintained by justice, which is a fruit of government, as government is from society and society from consent." He therefore proposed an international society for maintenance of the peace of the world. This has been the ideal of great men from that day to this. Wise steps toward the construction of such an international society with due regard to preserving the legitimate spheres of activity both of individual men and of nations constitute the most important item on the agenda for the peace of the world. The development of international society is necessarily a matter of slow growth and requires infinite patience and attention to detail. To do too much and to do it too soon is as dangerous as to do too little and to do it too late.

RESOLUTION

Without attempting to speak with reference to specific proposals, Indiana Yearly Meeting goes on record as rejoicing in the study of plans for the establishment and maintenance of peace through justice founded on law by men of good will over the world, and in particular it desires to commend the concerned spirit and nobility of purpose exemplified by such national characters as Herbert Hoover, a member of the Society of Friends, and Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States, in their efforts to further the peace of the world.

Further, Indiana Yearly Meeting, while holding its views that the ways of love and conciliation are superior in effectiveness to the use of force in world adjustments, expresses its belief that in a world accustomed to the use of force the so-called Fulbright resolution which commits the United States as "favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes," which was passed by such an overwhelming vote by The House of Representatives, is a step forward in the effort to better international relations.

The clerk is requested to send copies of the Preamble and Resolution, to the President and Vice-President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate and the House, and to the United States Senators from Ohio, Michigan, Washington and Indiana, and to the Representatives of the Congressional District in which the meetings of Indiana Yearly Meeting are located, and to Herbert Hoover and to Cordell Hull.

Friends reported to the Yearly Meeting a resolution which their group had unanimously adopted and decided to send it to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and to the United States Senators from Ohio, Michigan, Washington, and Indiana, and to the Representatives of the Congressional Districts in which the Meetings of Indiana Yearly Meeting are located; also to Herbert Hoover and Cordell Hull. It was as follows:

PREAMBLE

We, the Young Friends of the Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends, believe that any peace depending upon victory cannot be just and durable. A peace that demands unconditional surrender of one group of nations to another and preserves that peace by the enforcement of one will upon another, will inevitably fail. We must recognize in this present world conflict, that all people are guilty; that these people can realize a lasting peace only by the voluntary consent of all nations. It is necessary to displace hate, violence, and fear by Christian love, brotherhood, and cooperation. As a religious society, we should be prophets of a new order of international affairs, in which these Christian ideals would be fundamental.

RESOLUTION

Congress should appoint a commission to study the causes of war and to formulate the minimum requirements of a durable peace. Our government should define its peace aims and distribute statements of these aims to all peoples of the world, along with an invitation to all governments to send representatives to a world conference where, in a spirit of repentance and forgiveness, negotiations might be initiated for the establishment of peace at once.

Was the Young Friends' resolution which expresses distrust of peace based on victory more in keeping with the Friends peace testimony than that of the Yearly Meeting?

What sort of resolution should groups of Friends pass if they wish to be consistent with their peace testimony?

THE POWER OF LOVE AND GOOD WILL

BY FLOYD SCHMOE

When Friends felt an objection to giving blanket approval to the stated post war policies of the Secretary of State—policies upon which we were led into this war and upon which the war is now being fought—the resolution passed the Indiana Yearly Meeting (or so it appeared to some who still did not concur) upon the compromise statement that "in a world accustomed to the use of violence some armed force will still be necessary," and that "any step in the right direction is a good step."

I think that no one was under the delusion that the "adequate power" referred to by the Secretary of State, by Herbert Hoover and by William Dennis was other than armed force.

Armed force, in my experience, is always predicated upon violence.

I favor a clear and positive statement of a way of life, and of a foreign policy based on a way of life, which does away with the occasion for war, and I believe that Friends have such a way and such a policy to advocate. I also believe in commending right effort and right action wherever found, but I questioned the fundamental rightness of principle in the resolution as approved by the Yearly Meeting on at least two points:

1. Is violence ever justified in the conduct of human affairs?

2. Is a step "in the right direction," by that token, a "right" step?—the old question of ends and means.

I believe that legitimate force can be legitimately used where reason and fair dealing have first been tried and have failed. In police action this might involve the use of forceful restraint, but does not necessarily require violence. Soldiers, even though used as police, are armed for retaliation by violence, not for restraint. I do not approve of such a police force—local, national or international. Many would contend that such a police force would be entirely ineffectual. I would cite only the example of the pre-war London police who did not carry guns, or the Paris gendarmery who, though armed, were trained to use a long folded cape in a most effective manner.

It is this same reasoning which has led Friends to oppose capital punishment which, like war, is legalized, but not thereby, in our opinion, made "right." Because I believe the power of love and good will, even in affairs of state, to be the strongest force for good known to man, I am forced to believe that the use of force "with intent to harm" (violence) is never justified and that a step, even though it appears to be in the "right direction," which involves violence should not meet with our approval.

I would like to say further, though not in this same connection, that I was highly gratified by the attitude taken by President Dennis and Earlham College regarding the training of military units, and also the splendid attitude towards our Nisei students.

USE OF FORCE NOT SANCTIONED BY INDIANA YEARLY MEETING

BY MURRAY S. KENWORTHY

The report that Indiana Yearly Meeting adopted a resolution advocating the use of force in maintaining world peace has become so widespread that the readers of THE AMERICAN FRIEND should know the facts in the case.

The errors which reporters can commit, now and then, are often all but past understanding. For instance, a Dayton, Ohio, paper exactly reversed the facts in this case by saying, "This action was an historic one . . . and was not taken until the delegates had compelled revision of a resolution . . . which upheld the peace doctrines of the society." The facts are that the resolution, before revision, upheld the use of force in maintaining world peace and the Yearly Meeting sent it to a committee for revision.

Time Magazine, October 11, printed an article on the passing of the resolution, which many have read, and I have sent a letter to them in reply, a copy of which is printed here:

Dear Sirs: Your reporter (Time of October 11) has unfortunately misinterpreted certain ideas and practices of Friends (Quakers), particularly is he in error when he says that Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends approves the use of force in maintaining world peace. That proposition Indiana Yearly Meeting definitely rejected.

Three resolutions were introduced (sessions of September 22-26, 1943). Two came from certain departments of the Yearly Meeting, and since they carried statements in harmony with the peace views of Friends were adopted without a dissenting voice.

The third resolution, presented by an individual, did advocate the use of force in maintaining peace. It was not acceptable, as written, and was referred to a committee of five, of which I was a member. The objectionable paragraphs were rewritten. The final form reaffirmed Friends views that "the ways of love and conciliation are superior in effectiveness to the use of force in world adjustments." It also expressed "its belief that in a world accustomed to the use of force" the proposition to bring the nations into a world organization was a "step forward in the effort to better international relations."

Members of this committee, and the Yearly Meeting, maintain the thesis that force cannot bring to the world a just and durable peace. The present trend towards world organization will, we trust, ultimately lead to a form of world federation, based not on force, but on good will and conciliation.

WE APOLOGIZE

BY MERLE L. DAVIS

The local newspaper at Richmond, Indiana, on Sunday, September 26, came out with a bold headline stating that the day before the Friends of Indiana Yearly Meeting had approved the use of force in the maintenance of peace. A number of those who had approved the action taken by our yearly meeting

during that ill-fated Saturday session denied the implication which the paper attributed to the resolutions.

The young people of the Yearly Meeting, stirred by those un-Quakerly implications of the resolution which had been adopted earlier during the day, brought forward at their afternoon meeting and again that night, a statement that was more in keeping with the Friends' peace testimony.

An Earlham College student, who is not a member of the Society of Friends, came over to our home recently, *Time* magazine in her hand and asked, "Have you read the article in this magazine?" She referred to the statements on pages 46 and 48 of the October 11, 1943 issue of that periodical which states that for the first time since the founding of the Society by George Fox in 1668, by the action of Indiana Yearly Meeting a group of Friends have endorsed the use of force in international relations.

Tonight I was walking along Flagler Street of Miami, Florida, while here to take a plane for Cuba. Although unconscious of the fact that anybody in the city knew me, yet I was stopped by a former resident of Richmond, but not a Friend, who stated that she had seen by *Time* magazine that we had recently held an important meeting in Richmond.

Regardless of the purpose or virtue of that resolution endorsed by a majority of those voicing their approval or disapproval, it is apparent that as far as the general public is concerned, we gave expression to an attitude which is contrary to the historic peace testimony of the Society of Friends, and by that action we have discredited the most distinctive principle of the whole body of Quakers in the world. For that we humbly apologize.

During the sessions of the Five Years Meeting in 1917, under the enormous pressure of propaganda of that first World War period, statements were made on the floor, which if endorsed, would have compromised our position. But after a pointed discussion, and an intermission, Levi Pennington rose to his six feet or more of height and to his power of condensing a world of meaning into a few words and stated that nevertheless "God is still on his throne," and that the ways of love will ultimately triumph. A wave of relief passed over the audience. Levi Pennington was absent from the sessions of Indiana Yearly Meeting in 1943.

A few statements should be made:

1. In the final action of the yearly meeting we followed parlimentary procedure, rather than the time honored Quaker method of delaying action when there is a strong minority on important issues until we can become united in spirit. Had we followed the Friendly way we would have avoided this unfortunate implication that Quakers have endorsed the use of force.

2. Many were blinded on this issue of the use of force by the urgent desire to give expression to the firm conviction that the peace of the world can only be maintained by adequate world organization. On this point there was no division. Had that position been presented in a clear-cut constructive resolution, free from the implications of the endorsement of military force as the method of obtaining that world organization, Indiana Yearly Meeting would have wholeheartedly united on it. The writer believes that the whole body of Friends present that day was convinced that international lawlessness must give way to sufficient international organization to obtain cooperation, and that to secure this the United States will have to abandon its policy of relative isolation and self interest in peace time.

3. We did not discuss sufficiently the implications of an international police force to give a settled opinion on the use of force as a method of obtaining international cooperation which the press has attributed to our decision. We believe in law and order. In thinking of "police" we think of an officer who takes charge of an individual or individuals who may be offending public morality. With that we are in agreement. But in thinking of policemen we are not in the habit of thinking of troops of blue coats which march against the offender's home, kill his innocent wife, burn down the house, wound some of the children, and leave the rest to wander in exile and hunger for months or years, while the guilty individual may even escape and go free. In thinking of policemen we do not have in mind that the state of Indiana will march a company of state militia, equipped with tanks, cannon, and battleships on the Wabash against a similar organized force from Illinois to destroy the homes, crops, public buildings, innocent people and the civilization of each state when a difference may arise between them. Theoretically such a fantastic possibility might come true. But that is not what we think of when we say "policeman." Instead we think of the power behind the law which takes charge of the one, two, or three offending individuals while at the same time protecting the innocent and their property.

If in the development of world society an international police can, in an orderly fashion, step into any country and pick out the offending individual, be he an Adolph Hitler or a Benedict Arnold, try him before a court of justice, protect his family, his neighbors, and the civilization of his community, then we would have an analogous situation. But if the international police force means war as we know it today, or leads to that mass destruction of the innocent and the civilization of a people, then there is nothing in the connotation of the term "police force" today that is analogous.

To a large extent we are exhibiting today the effect of the use of an international police force. England and France, backed by an intangible sympathetic feeling in the United States, guaranteed the freedom of Poland and Czechoslovakia. Germany was suffering from economic chaos and had a growing feeling that she was not getting justice. A leader came along who, to some of the people, seemed to have the qualities that could obtain by force what his people had not obtained by peaceful methods. The mad years of 1933 to 1939 followed. That country withdrew from the League of Nations. England and France warned her that they would use their forces to protect Poland and Czechoslovakia. As a result the world has divided into two warring camps. It may happen again. Then it may be one race against another.

Unfortunately we of Indiana Yearly Meeting took an ill-advised action which has led the press to state that we endorse the use of such a force and thereby we, the second largest yearly meeting of Friends in the world, have digressed from the time honored peace postion of the Society of Friends. This has brought discredit to our whole Society. For that we apologize. We are sorry. Perhaps next year we can do better.

PEACE AND FORCE

By William C. Dennis

The resolutions in regard to peace which were adopted at Indiana Yearly Meeting last September have given rise to some comment in the public press and some discussion among Friends. Perhaps the most sensational comment is an article in *Time* magazine which referred to these resolutions as "history-making" and said that, "For the first time since George Fox founded the Religious Society of Friends in 1668 a group of Quakers endorsed the use of force by Quakers." The present writer was the author of one of these resolutions in its original form and was cognizant of the other. He never dreamed that they were history-making and never supposed that they were revolutionary. He does think that they were and are a reasonable expression of the views of a great majority of the members of Indiana Yearly Meeting, whether present or absent at the time they were adopted, upon the important subjects to which they relate.

It is submitted that most of the interest which has been aroused and difference of opinion which may have developed has grown out of the debate

these resolutions in the face of the eeting and not out of the text of the solutions themselves. This article will al only with what *Time* calls "Resolu- on No. 1," the resolution endorsing the ulbright Resolution in Congress as "a ep forward."

The preamble to this resolution stated at Friends are "deeply concerned in e terms of peace and in the post-war ttlement;" that the acid test of the erits of any proposed provision in the ettlement "is whether or not it is con- ucive to a just and lasting peace;" hat plans for the development of "an nternational society for the maintenance f peace" such as those originally pro- osed by William Penn in 1693 constitute he most important item on the agenda or the peace of the world and that it is ust as important not to go too fast in his direction as to move too slowly. No lifference of opinion apparently arose s respects these general propositions.

The original resolution which followed his preamble, after approving "the study of plans for the establishment and maintenance of peace through justice founded on law by men of good will all over the world," went on specifically to commend "the concerned spirit and the general method of approach to these all-important questions exemplified by Herbert Hoover, a member of the Society of Friends, and Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States in his radio address of September 12." This was subsequently modified in committee so as to commend "the concerned spirit and nobility of purpose exemplified by such national characters as Herbert Hoover and Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States, in their efforts to further the peace of the world." It is submitted that this change, which was made in order to avoid any possible appearance of expressing approval of certain statements of Secretary Hull in his address about the use of force, was proper but unnecessary. The original resolution merely commended "the concerned spirit and general method of approach," (in Hull's case in a certain speech) whereas the modified resolution commended "the concerned spirit and nobility of purpose" of these two men. Neither the original nor the modified resolution involved the approval of any particular statements. There was no opposition in committee to the change.

The next paragraph of the original resolution merely expressed gratification at the passage of the Fulbright resolution, which it quoted. In committee this paragraph was amplified to read as follows:

"Further, Indiana Yearly Meeting, while holding its views that the ways of love and conciliation are superior in effectiveness to the use of force in world adjustments, expresses its belief that in a world accustomed to the use of force the so-called Fulbright resolution which commits the United States as 'favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes,' which was passed by such an overwhelming vote by the House of Representatives, is a step forward in the effort to better international relations."

The changes here consist, first, in the addition at the beginning of the paragraph of a reiteration of Friends' views that the ways of love and conciliation are superior in effectiveness to the use of force. Surely no Friend would deny this and many who are not Friends would accept it. Certainly the author of the original resolution would not deny it and had no objection to the insertion of this statement. Second, instead of merely expressing gratification at the passage of the Fulbright resolution by Congress, the amended Indiana Yearly Meeting resolution expressed the belief that "in a world accustomed to the use of force the so-called Fulbright resolution . . . is a step forward." Again it is submitted that the textual change is immaterial. Nobody would deny that we are living in "a world accustomed to the use of force," and obviously nobody who was in favor of the passage of the Fulbright resolution would deny that it is "a step forward." The author of the original resolution readily accepted these changes without believing that they affected the true meaing and intent of the resolution but recognizing that they made the resolution more acceptable to some who feared that in its original form it might be regarded as an endorsement of the use of force in international relations. It was the steady contention of the author of the resolution maintained at all times on the floor of the Yearly Meeting and in committee that there was nothing revolutionary in the original resolution, that it did not involve any approval of force except in the sense in which William Penn approved force in his essay on the peace of Europe in 1693. Penn's essay contains every substantive argument ever made on the subject of war and peace. When Penn was faced with the objection that "the strongest and richest sovereignty will never agree" to the league of nations which he was proposing, he replied, "I answer, . . . he is not stronger than all the rest and for that reason you should promote this and compel him into it; especially before he be so, for then it will be too late to deal with such a one." In other words, Penn proposed a league of nations and approved the use of force to compel the strongest nation to enter it and obviously he was ready to use force against any member nation which thereafter resorted to force, this presumably upon the theory that this was not war in the true sense of the word but the use of police force on an international scale in order to maintain the peace of the world through justice under law. As Penn puts it, "peace is maintained by justice, which is a fruit of government, as government is from society and society from consent." But "consent" in his mind did not necessarily mean unanimous consent, for he was ready to compel the consent of "the strongest and richest sovereignty" if necessary.

The government of the city of Richmond for nearly a century and a quarter, the seat of Indiana Yearly Meeting, rests ultimately on force. The proof of this obvious statement is not far to seek. Not long ago Richmond made the front page of the papers all over the country because a strike leader threatened the "spilling of blood in the gutters" and made good this threat. Violent resistance to the law met law enforcement, first by the policeman's club and then by orderly judicial procedure, and although the record was marred by the excessive zeal of certain police officers on the one hand and by ill considered executive clemency on the other, nevertheless in general the law prevailed and the community was reminded that in this world "accustomed to the use of force" all law still ultimately rests on force. Yet Friends believe and always have believed in local government and presumably Friends are not ready to dispense with law enforcement in Richmond. In like manner the government of the State of Indiana and of the thirteen original states rests on force. In 1787 the thirteen original states, in order to form a more perfect union, created the government of the United States. Doubtless there were some Friends who agreed with Patrick Henry and others in opposing the establishment of the federal government, but it is to be hoped that they did not oppose it as Quakers on the ground that the federal government would rest ultimately on force just exactly as the state governments under which they were then living rested on force.

In like manner when the nations of the world are considering the creation of an embryonic world government Quakers, like others, will doubtless differ as to the wisdom of any particular plan or league or association or government which may be proposed, but surely they should not object *simply* because it is a government and therefore, until such time as the lion lies down with the lamb, it must rest on force. The force neces-

sary to hold together an international government confessedly might assume large proportions. An international *posse comitatus* might to the outward eye look like an army, but in reality the force used by a world organization or government to maintain the peace of the world is a very different thing from the force employed in ordinary warfare between independent sovereign states. A struggle between two independent sovereignties is war. Force applied by an international government to prevent a breach of the peace by a member nation is, it is submitted, in its essence simply police force on a large scale and it is believed may be consistently supported by Friends irrespective of whether or not they are orthodox and absolute pacifists.

It should be noted in this connection that it is necessary to draw a sharp distinction between two issues: First, the issue which has divided Friends since the days of Fox and Penn between those who have accepted absolute pacifism and those who have not. This difference has been manifested through all the history of the Society and in this country has been illustrated in every war by outstanding Quakers from Nathaniel Greene to Herbert Hoover. Second, and that is the only issue that interests us at present—the question as to whether or not the resolutions adopted by Indiana Yearly Meeting attempted to decide the first issue in favor of the non-absolutists, and it is believed that they did not.

In conclusion it is respectfully submitted (1) that there is no substantial difference between the true meaning and significance of the resolution under discussion as originally introduced and as subsequently modified and adopted; (2) that in neither form does the resolution contemplate any radical departure from the time-honored position of Friends as respects war between sovereign states and police force within the state; (3) that the resolution makes no attempt to decide the age-old difference of opinion between those Friends who are absolute pacifists and those who are not; (4) that the resolution does commit Indiana Yearly Meeting to a generally forward-looking position as respects the gradual evolution of international government, albeit it falls far short both absolutely and relatively of the advanced position taken by William Penn 250 years ago.

SHALL FRIENDS TAKE PART IN CURRENT POLITICAL ISSUES?

By Lowell D. Cox

There are certain words in the resolution which Indiana Yearly Meeting passed on September 25 (see page 436) to which I should like to attract the reader's attention. You may wish to underscore them: *While holding its views that the ways of love and conciliation are superior in effectiveness to the use of force in world adjustments*, then later, *is a step forward.*

Time magazine referred to the resolution thus: "for the first time since George Fox . . . a group of Quakers endorsed the use of force by Quakers." I regard the interpretation which *Time* placed upon the resolution as misleading, to say the least. Since the sessions of Indiana Yearly Meeting ended I have been accosted more than once with the question, "What's this about the Yearly Meeting passing a resolution favoring war?" Such was certainly not the spirit of those who favored the resolution, and I find it difficult to find any basis for such a statement in the resolution. Such wide spread notice of the resolution has caused me, moreover, to make a more searching analysis—in my own mind—of the attitude which I felt, at the time, to be a perfectly natural and logical one to take. What follows is said with humble spirit, for I have the utmost respect for those few but weighty Friends who opposed it.

It seems to me that in accepting this resolution we merely recognized the basic phenomena of social and political evolution. In the days of the cave man, when man went out to get a wife, he took along a club; he knocked her over the head and "drug" her home! In the course of human development man discovered that a less violent approach was more satisfactory, so he bought his wife instead of stealing her. Is the idealist to be denied the right of saying that the latter solution is "better" than the first?

So in the field of political and social development we have come to the point where many feel that there is a real possibility of eliminating present world anarchy by some sort of world government. Beyond doubt there will be many imperfections—even real evil in such a system. But is the pacifist to be denied the right of saying, "international government is *better* than international anarchy?"

Though there is evil in the practice of buying a wife, there are few who would not agree that it is "better" than risking mayhem. But can the pacifists make judgment between "better" or "worse"? Are there "grays" between the black and the white to which the pacifist can point and say, "*This* is better than *that?* This, while not perfect, is a step toward the ideal."

None can deny the desirability of a world community in which all peoples can mingle in fellowship and brotherhood—a world in which force and coercion are absent. But I feel there are few pacifists, and certainly no sociologist or political scientist, who feels that that *state of* affairs is the *next step* in the course of human development. The question arises, then, as to whether the pacifist can support the reforms and movements which lead to his ideal?

Human institutions have always developed slowly. In the course of history mankind has not jumped from the "present state of affairs" to the "ideal" without going through an infinite number of steps between. I see no factors which lead me to believe that this is the exception—that this is once when we can jump from the present state of affairs to the ideal. Why can we not express approval of any progress toward the ideal?

Doubtless the Society of Friends has a special obligation to instill in others the spirit of which George Fox spoke. But there are few who would argue that social institutions have no effect upon the individual's personality and soul. I for one, feel that I must support any change of man's social institutions which will make for an environment more conducive to the type of spirit which will eliminate wars. Because those institutions haven't even approached perfection, must I refuse to throw my support to each forward step which is taken?

Because there will be many imperfections in any world organization following this war, must the pacifist sit back and have no pronouncement to make concerning it? Certain groups of our Mennonite friends believe that they are *in* the world, but not *of* it. They have nothing to do with the government, refusing even to vote. I can see the validity of the position based upon that premise.

Few Friends believe that they are not of this world; I personally, feel that I must reserve the right to express judgment in any field of human activity and thought. When asked the question, "Do you feel that a type of world government, involving force, represents an advance over the present world anarchy?" I find it difficult to understand any other reply than an emphatic "Yes"—being careful at the same time to point toward the ideal that we are trying to achieve, which I think was done in the resolution in question.

Thus far I have tacitly assumed that international government *of any sort* is better than anarchy. Turning to the type of world organization which may come, I feel that the *worst* possible type that could come would be a situation where the force of the world government would be turned on a whole nation rather than upon individuals within the nation. Even in the extreme case, where nations, not individuals, will be held responsible, it seems that a situation where a whole nation of people knows that if certain things are done, war will

e made upon them—that would be pre-erable to the present state of affairs where each nation plays a game of hance, daring a little there, backing own here, and never quite knowing at what point another nation's patience will e worn thin, and war ensue.

Those who opposed the resolution un-loubtedly feel that we "watered down" ur testimony, that we must work to roduce in man's soul the spirit which will "take away the occasion of all war." feel that they might have felt that it was a proposition of either, or—*either* approve the resolution *or* work for the deal. I, for one, having approved of what I considered a forward step, intend to work to the fullest of my abilities for the "ideal."

"CHOOSE YE THIS DAY WHOM YE WILL SERVE"

By DONALD MCKINNEY

Jesus recognized the weakness of man-kind. He knew that worldly things sometimes turned trusted leaders aside from the true faith, that under the stress of the times men may falter in their convictions in order to be in tune with the times. Yet Jesus made it clear over and over again by his words that there is no middle road to the Kingdom of Heaven. He classed men in two groups, those who were for him and those who were against him.

The Society of Friends has long been known as one of the historic peace societies. Are we still a peace society today or have we dropped the torch our fathers passed on to us? Does the peace message receive a friendly hear-ing in our meeting today? Is the majority of our young men in CPS camps or in the armed forces? We like to think we are pacifists, but are we? We hate war, yes—but could it be that too many of us also hate the Germans and the Japanese?

The press has recently told the world that we have departed from the ways of our fathers. We may offer in defense that we did not intend to, but unfortu-nately the press does not judge us by our good intentions. The facts seem evident. We do not question what a pacifist, an idealist, or any individual may believe, but we do ask if he is not trampling upon the rights of others if he uses the church as a means of foster-ing "anti-Christ" declarations or reso-lutions? We live in a suffering world and the minute we lower the ideals of our church, all hope for mankind is lost. We may gain the world—but we lose our soul. The idealist does not need to sit back and do nothing. As a citizen he may vote, and may serve as a rep-resentative of his government, as means of bringing about the reforms he desires.

Since the resolution was passed by Indiana Yearly Meeting, we are on record, rightly or wrongly, as approving the use of force in international peace efforts, call it armed force, blockades, sanctions, starvation, police force, what-ever we choose. If this is not the will of the majority of Friends, then it behooves every Yearly Meeting in America to repudiate the action of Indiana Yearly Meeting in approving and adopting the resolution it did by positive statements to the opposite effect.

We are led to this conclusion: faith and belief in God are an individual mat-ter. Neither our church nor our govern-ment can rob us of our conscience. To the thousands of Friends everywhere as well as individuals of other faiths who share our peace testimony as expressed in the teaching of Christ about love and brotherhood, we say—hold fast to your faith! God has given you the right to choose whom ye will serve.

MINISTRY AND OVERSIGHT RESOLUTION

Adopted by Indiana Yearly Meeting

The Meeting on *Ministry and Over-sight* has approved the following state-ment and recommendations and is re-ferring them to the Yearly Meeting for consideration.

1. That Indiana Yearly Meeting re-affirms its adherence to the established testimony of Friends on peace, as ex-pressed in the Discipline of Indiana Yearly Meeting, which reads as follows:

"We feel bound explicity to avow our unshaken persuasion that all war is utterly incompatible with the plain pre-cepts of our Divine Lord and Law-giver and the whole spirit of His Gospel, and that no plea of necessity or policy, how-ever urgent or peculiar, can avail to re-lease either individuals or nations from the paramount allegiance which they owe to Him who hath said "Love your enemies (Matthew V: 44, Luke VI: 27). In enjoying this love, and the forgive-ness of injuries, He who has bought us to Himself has not prescribed for man precepts which are incapable of being carried into practice, or of which the practice is to be postponed until all shall be persuaded to act upon them. We can-not doubt that they are incumbent now, and that we have in the prophetic Scrip-tures the distinct intimation of their direct application not only to individuals but to nations also. (Isaiah II: 4, Micah IV: 1). When nations conform their laws to this Divine teaching, wars must necessarily cease.

"We would, in humility, but in faith-fulness to our Lord, express our firm per-suasion that all the exigencies of civil government and social order may be met under the banner of the Prince of Peace, in strict conformity with His com-mands."

2. We do not censure Friends who have conscientiously participated in any way in the war effort, any more than we censure ourselves; we confess our failure in that we have not created conditions which might have done much in avoiding this war. We know that it is extremely difficult for any one to avoid a relation-ship to the war and to maintain the status of an absolute pacifist and that we are all in some way aiding the present conflict. Rather we urge that Friends cultivate diligently the tradi-tional practice of our Society in main-taining that sensitiveness of conscience that comes only through constant contact in prayer and humility with the source of spiritual power; that we strive to rear our children in the home, in the church and in the school in an appreciation of the overpowering force of love; that we inspect and, if possible, support all movements, national and international, that look toward the establishment of a just and permanent peace, and allow no pressure of partisan politics to prevent our support of such efforts.

3. We recommend that the Yearly Meeting direct that the section of the Discipline on Peace, referred to above, be read in all the Monthly Meetings of Indiana Yearly Meeting.

4. We further recommend that a statement be sent to our government ex-pressing our appreciation for the pro-visions in the Selective Service Act for the freedom of conscience as contained in our Constitution, by providing for conscientious objectors, both in Civilian Public Service Camps and non-combatant service. This is the most en-lightened action by the government up to the present time under war conditions.

The way of Christ is followed not by those who would be mighty and power-ful, but by those who would serve. His peace for the world will be won by those who follow him in repentance and will-ingness to forgive.—*Virginia Quarterly Meeting Bulletin.*

* * * *

The entire church of Christ has got to have a revival—We must have a pro-found spiritual awakening on evangelis-tic lines.

RUFUS M. JONES.

* * * *

Whatever happens we must go on and persevere, falling and rising again, stumbling and recovering, failing and beginning anew. This undiscourageable spirit is the sure evidence of our being in the Way.

How to Save the Starving Children of Europe Without Aiding the Enemy

By Howard E. Kershner

Editorial Note: Friends everywhere interested in this cause should write to their representatives and senators expressing their endorsement of this child feeding program in Europe. It is reported that a public hearing is scheduled for November 4 on Senate Resolution 100, urging action to save the children of the occupied democracies. Senator Elbert D. Thomas is Chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to which this Resolution has been referred. Congressman Sol Bloom is Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in charge of House Resolution 117. Ministers will do much to aid this cause by having members sign a petition in favor of this program. Remember your government is now favorably disposed towards helping these children. Now is the time for us to assume our responsibility. Readers of THE AMERICAN FRIEND *will remember that one of Walter Woodward's last great concerns was for the feeding of these children.*

HITLER'S proud boast that the Germans are a superior race will come true to the extent that we allow him to destroy the freedom-loving people of Europe by starvation and to render those that are left, subnormal in mind and body. People who have eaten well are indeed superior to those who are undersized and riddled with disease.

It is not only good charity, but the best of strategy to save the starving children of the Nazi-dominated countries of Europe. These people are our friends and allies. They have fought for liberty for centuries before our country was born. They are still fighting for it. They crave our moral support and help. To save their children now would win their friendship and affection forever. We need their help now, and we shall desperately need it in the reconstruction days ahead. How will we ever reëstablish Democracy as the ruling philosophy of government if we allow Hitler to destroy the democratic peoples of Europe?

At no expense to ourselves and without using any ships or food which we or our allies need, it is possible to save many of these starving little ones. It is not only a human obligation, but it will help to shorten the war.

Having recently discussed this matter with many of the chief officials of the American and British Governments; with the heads of the Governments of the Nazi-occupied countries; with the editors of the leading British and American publications; with thousands of individuals in the question periods following more than one hundred public addresses in these two countries, and with a large number of correspondents in both countries resulting from nearly fifty previous radio talks, I should like to answer every doubt and difficulty that may be in your mind on this subject, and to show from experience how we can be sure that controlled child feeding would not aid the enemy, but would save the children; would give courage and strength to our friends and allies, and would make post-war reconstruction much less difficult.

OBJECTION No. 1. The Nazis would take the food.

From four years' experience directing relief work in Europe, I am glad to report that the Nazis have never taken a mouthful of our food. Our own State Department is authority for the fact that the Germans do not take any of the 19,000 tons of food going to Greece each month, that the operation is of no benefit to Axis economy, and that it does save the Greeks. I received the same assurance from the Ministry of Economic Warfare in London last winter. Since the Germans do not take the food going to Greece and since they did not take our food in France, it is reasonable to assume that they would not take food which we might now send to Norway, Holland, Belguim and France.

But assume the worst, suppose they did take it, what would be the result? As only small amounts would be sent at one time, they could not seize more than enough for one meal for the civilian population of Germany. This, of course, would immediately bring the operation to a close. The small gain accruing to Germany from having seized a little bit of food would be far outweighed by the psychological advantage on our side. Over the short wave radio, we would tell our friends in Europe that we were anxious to feed their children, but that the Germans had taken the food, and the operation must, therefore, he stopped. We would have given them moral encouragement, we would continue to enjoy their affection and friendship, and we would have given the lie to the Nazi propaganda that these people are starving because of our blockade.

Thus, the very worst thing that could happen would be to our advantage. But experience indicates that the Germans would not take the food and that the children would be saved.

OBJECTION No. 2. The Germans might not take the food which we send, but would take an equivalent amount of local food out of the country.

If the operation were properly controlled, they could not do this. Let me explain.

Every child helped should be required to exhaust its own ration card before being given a supplement of imported food. If the child eats all of the local food to which it is entitled—its full share—just as much as if no foreign relief were available, it is obvious that there is no equivalent left over as a result of the operation by which the Nazis could profit. True enough, the Germans take food from all of these countries, but the point is that they did not take any more as a result of our operations. In our colonies, we completely exhausted the French ration card of each child each month before drawing upon our supplies of imported food. We are certain, therefore, that this did not leave any direct way by which the Germans could have profited.

OBJECTION No. 3. The Germans would reduce the ration cards of the children whom we helped, so that although the child might exhaust his ration card, the card itself would call for less food, which would leave a residue by which the Nazis could profit.

From experience, I can tell you that the Germans did not do this. The children whom we helped continued to have exactly the same ration cards as the children whom we were not helping. This objection, therefore, falls down in the light of experience. The evidence on this point is very clear, for the children receiving our extra rations maintained their health and continued to grow and gain weight, while the other unfortunate children stopped growing, developed anemia, rickets and tuberculosis.

We should have been feeding at least 2,000,000 children in Southern France alone, but we were not permitted to bring food through the blockade and had to depend upon supplies which we had bought in Asia, Africa and Central Europe in 1940 and the early part of 1941. This forced us to limit the number of children fed to 100,000, imposing upon us the terrible necessity of deciding which children should eat and which should starve. With the help of the school-physicians we selected the most needy children who were admitted to our canteens. The others, who were suffering almost as badly, would ask in polite though weak little voices why they too could not eat. I never found a satisfactory answer to the question of why a hungry child should not eat, especially when I came home and found that we

re wasting more food than would be required to save the lives of those starving innocent little victims.

Of course, if the Germans discriminated against the children being helped, that would constitute a violation of the agreement and the operation would immediately be stopped, but up to now they have not done so.

OBJECTION No. 4. We cannot burden the American taxpayer with additional expense.

We are not asking for any money from our Government or by private subscription. Norway, Holland, Belgium and France have funds of their own in this country more than sufficient to pay for all of the food that it is proposed to send. The operation could be financed by unblocking a portion of these funds. The heads of these governments have all assured me of their eagerness to use some of their resources in this manner. It would cost the American people nothing. These four countries are mentioned because, until recently at least, Denmark was not suffering so severely, help is already going to Greece, and it is not possible to reach Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, and occupied Russia.

OBJECTION No. 5. Ships cannot be spared to send the food.

We would not use a single ship available for the war effort. Neutral ships which cannot be hired for war purposes would be used.

OBJECTION No. 6. In view of our own growing shortage, we haven't the food to spare.

A few weeks, ago, I saw a dispatch from the Department of Agriculture in Washington, stating that the American people are still wasting enough food to feed 20,000,000 people the year around. That is more than three times as much as we are asking permission to send to Europe. We are, therefore, in the unenviable position of not being willing to allow a portion of the crumbs which fall from our table to be used to save the lives of our neighbors' children, who are the hope of the future.

All that it is proposed to send from this country is a little grain, of which we still have a surplus, and the meat, fat, and milk required could be brought from South America. Our own food scarcity, therefore, is no excuse for inaction.

Quite rightly, we will now begin feeding the Italians. But how will it look to the people of the occupied countries who have fought on our side for more than three years for us to continue starving them while we feed the Italians, who have fought against us for over three years? What faith will any people have in our moral protestations if we starve our own allies and friends. Military necessity might require the starvation of all of Europe if by so doing we could starve the enemy, but we cannot do that in any event. There is enough food in Europe to feed the Germans, and we may be sure that they will get it. What we can do and are doing is to starve the democratic, freedom-loving people who are doing their valiant best for our cause.

OBJECTION No. 7. No American could work in any occupied country, and we would not be sure of careful supervision.

It is true that no American organization could work in these Nazi-occupied countries, but the International Red Cross, with a neutral personnel, which does it so well in Greece, is ready to undertake the responsibility of distribution. We may be sure, therefore, that the operation would be properly controlled.

These objections sum up the whole case against feeding, and they all disappear in the light of experience. There is, then, no reason why we should not send help to these children, and there is every reason of humanity and strategy why we should do so.

If these starving children were sitting on your doorstep tonight and you could see their piteous eyes, set in bloodless faces, begging even for the garbage from your kitchens, you would feed them. You could not eat yourself until you had done so. Because they are across the sea does not lessen their suffering or our obligation. Please help us mobilize public opinion on behalf of sending food to these tragic little victims of war. Tell your friends and neighbors how this can be done without aiding the enemy. Take the matter up in your societies, clubs, lodges, Parent-Teacher Associations. Ask your ministers to preach about it. Write letters to your papers and ask your editors to write editorials. Make sure that your Senators and your Congressmen, the President and the Secretaries of State and War know how you feel about the matter.

Bi-partisan House Resolution No. 117 asks the Administration to take immediate action to save the children. I am sure your Congressman would welcome a letter from you, stating your opinion of this matter. Senate Resolution No. 100 is the same as the House Resolution. I know your two Senators would be glad to have a letter from you on this subject.

Our officials in Washington are very favorably disposed toward making a controlled effort to help the children. Let us support and encourage them. I am not asking you to do anything opposed to the policy of our government in beseeching you to help give a demonstration of the desire of the American people that these children be saved. Neither am I asking for any anti-British action, for I have overwhelming evidence that this cause is very popular in public and private circles throughout the British Isles.

On the platform, through the generous press, and over the air, I shall continue to report to you on various phases of the subject. Please make your own influence felt in every possible way on behalf of these starving little ones. Remember the words of the Master, "It were better that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were cast into the sea than that he should offend one of these little ones." Will you do something about it?

* * * *

The above talk was given over the Columbia Broadcasting System at 10:45 Saturday evening, September 25. Copies may be obtained in any quantity, free of charge, from the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. The response to this talk, which was heard by an estimated audience of 12,000,000, has been nation-wide. Fifty thousand copies have been printed in order to meet the demand. It was the forty-fourth of a series of radio talks given by Howard Kershner in an effort to mobilize public opinion on behalf of saving the starving children of Europe. In addition he has given eighty-seven public addresses and held sixty editorial conferences in the principal cities of the country during the past summer.

PROVIDENCE OF BEAUTY

Southward now across the sky
Tanager and bluebird fly;
Buoyant now on rainbow feathers
Hummingbirds brave winds and
weathers;
And the wren and robin dare
Now the highways of the air.

Swift their fragile wings shall span
Heaven, down to Yucatan;
Some may dip a dainty bill
In a dew-drop of Brazil;
And a northern bird may dine
From the wild vanilla vine.

Heaven's feathered canticles,
Like a drift of flying bells!
Sun and lightning, wind and space,
Do not daunt your supple grace:
"Beauty" (so you say) "is strong:
Space is but the road of song!"

E. Merrill Root.

Book Reviews

World Federation. What Are the Difficulties? by Norman Thomas. The Post War World Council, New York, 1942. 22 pp., Price 10c.

The subtitle of this pamphlet explains its purpose and use. The implications of the ideas of "world federation," "world government," and "world cooperation" are not sufficiently searched out and criticised either by their proponents or by their opponents. If we are to be realistic we must understand what it actually is that we are talking about, and strive to the best of our ability to avoid loose thinking and loose talking on world government. If we are not willing to become realistic we shall see a continuation of the old game of power politics, American isolation or more probably American imperialism, and the growing certainty of the outbreak of World War III.

Some of the difficulties to which Norman Thomas calls attention are: (1) the easy and pleasant fallacy of thinking there is a parallel between the establishment of a world government and the establishment of our own Federal Government in 1789, (2) the inevitability of military coercion and hate in a highly centralized world state, (3) the strengthening of future isolationism by the self-sufficiency which the war is forcing on us, and by the psychological aftermath of disillusionment, (4) the loss of organizations which have been carriers of international idealism, (5) the unrealism of *imposing* democracy, (6) the Versailles crazy quilt of little nations fictitiously equal to the large, (6) confusion over the nature of an international police force, (7) total victory with its consequences of vengeance, temptation to imperialism and fresh quarrels among the victors, and (8) the very popular notion of the long armistice which in reality may mean only militarism, imperialism and quarrels.

The beginnings of world federation should be sought in recognition that "actually social organization is more of a growth than a structure," in the passion for peace, in "minimum, not maximum, concessions of power," and the growth of self-government everywhere, and in work for the declaration of peace plans, fair to the peoples of enemy countries, by our own and other countries.

CATHERINE BRUNER.

Shall We Rule Germany? by Oswald Garison Villard, 22 pages, 10 cents, Post War Council, 112 East 19th Street, New York City.

From a background of lengthy association with German people, and with practical insight into their needs and the needs of the entire world, the author points out the fallacy of attempting any imposed supervision of education in Germany by the United States. (Such supervision has been proposed by Washington, and many Americans have approved it, not realizing the implications nor the futility of this plan.) He goes on to discuss, with the authority of Truth behind him, the unfortunate results of this dictatorial policy by America in other areas of German life.

But Oswald Villard does not content himself merely with criticism. He outlines briefly a convincing and workable blueprint for post-war Germany, based upon Christian principles. This little pamphlet is an excellent study booklet and should be used widely by Friends and other groups as a basis for discussion. Having once read this treatise, alert Friends will feel constrained to work for the defeat of the Washington plan while there is yet time, substituting for it a cooperative system of solving difficulties which will meet the approval of the German people.

CAROLYN E. COX.

Comparative Peace Plans, by Theodore Paullin. The Pacifist Research Bureau, Philadelphia, May, 1943. 87 pp., price 25c.

As the foreword says, this pamphlet is an attempt to discuss all *types* of plans or proposals for post-war international political organization, rather than all individual plans which now are vast in number. A number of proposals discussed, however, are those of individual persons simply because of the important position of the individual—as for example, President Roosevelt, whose proposals are found to be extremely vague when you get beyond the first generalities, Vice-President Wallace who thinks of the "century of the common man," Secretary of the Navy Knox who looks forward to an era of American imperialism.

The plans are divided into those that are official and unofficial. Among the official plans are those of Britain, whose leaders are still imperialists; Russia, whose intentions still remain an enigma; continental governments in exile, thinking first of all of their own restoration; and China, the statements of whose leaders go far beyond those of the west in daring and enlightenment. The unofficial plans discussed in the pamphlet are too numerous for a brief review. Among them are individual and group proposals; there is a section devoted to church proposals and another to pacifist solutions. "Religious leaders and pacifists generally approach the problem from a different point of view. (i.e., different from that of the secular.) Instead of placing emphasis upon the interest of their particular nation-state and upon its power in the post-war family of nations, they establish certain principles which arise from the Christian concept of the universal brotherhood of man and they measure every proposal for political organization against these principles."

The pamphlet ends with a rather heartening list of concerns upon the importance of which there is almost universal agreement among all planners, such as relief and rehabilitation and international trade, but these obviously lead away from purely political fields. The foreword promised further pamphlets on economic factors and it is to be hoped that they will be forthcoming.

CATHERINE BRUNER.

Pattern for Peacemakers by R. Alfred Hassler. Fellowship of Reconciliation, New York, 1943. 44 pages, 25 cents.

Pattern for Peacemakers was written for high school young people but will be found profitable and enjoyable reading for any age. By means of this pamphlet you can get a quick idea of some very fundamental considerations in the matter of developing a just and durable peace. The pamphlet is attractively printed with intriguing little sketches every page or so. After every chapter there are "Questions for Further Thinking" and suggestions for using the chapter in the program of a young people's group. The book can be heartily recommended for young Friends' Sunday school classes or evening meetings. It is one of the Forerunners Study Books put out by the Fellowship of Reconciliation for use with the Forerunners which is a high school group which the Fellowship of Reconciliation is promoting.

The five chapters in the pamphlet take up first "the dream of a better world," contrasted with war as it really is, not as it appears in the headlines. The second chapter goes on with a presentation of aims for a warless world and something of the general method for working toward such a world. It says in this chapter:

"Methods Must Be Consistent With Motives."

Here is the point at which the most sincere of us often slip up. We persuade ourselves that "the end justifies the means," and in order to accomplish something that we believe to be good

itself, we are willing to use evil thods. Unhappily, this never works. . We live in what we call a 'strictly ral universe.' The third chapter, fter the Last Bomb Falls" takes up blems and conditions which must be ed at the end of the war, and the rth chapter tells how these problems to be faced. The fifth chapter gives ggestions for beginning today in our n communities to build a warless rld. A quotation I like from this apter is as follows:

'What is most needed to build a better rld is not a series of blueprints of political, economic, and social aspects a post-war order, but a pattern of ought that will place justice and kind-ess above revenge and hate."

LILLIAN WHITE SHEPARD.

TOWARD FELLOWSHIP IN MEDITATION

Conducted by Herman Newman

EACH IN HIS OWN TONGUE

The multitude came together, and ere confounded, because that every an heard them speak in his own nguage. Acts 2:6.

Indian language does not lend itself adily to literal translation. In their tercourse with each other the various ibes have evolved a sign language, ore or less universally used. The fol-wing is a rendering of the Twenty-ird Psalm as the Indian would express in this sign language:

The Great Father is a Shepherd Chief. am His, and with Him I want not. He rows out to me a rope, and the name that rope is love, and He draws me, nd He draws me, and He draws me to ie place where the grass is green and ie water is not dangerous, and I eat nd lie down satisfied.

Sometimes my heart is very weak and alls down, but He lifts it up again nd draws me into a good road. His ame is wonderful.

Sometime, it may be very soon, it may e longer, it may be a very long, long ime, He will draw me into a place etween mountains. It is dark there ut I'll draw back not, I'll be afraid ot, for it is there between these ountains that the Shepherd Chief will neet me, and the hunger I have felt in ny heart all through this life will be atisfied.

Sometimes he makes the love rope nto a ship, but afterwards He gives me staff to lean on.

He spreads a table before me with ll kinds of food. He puts His hands on my head, and all the "tired" is gone. My cup He fills till it runs over.

What I tell you is true; I lie not. These roads "away ahead" will stay with me through this life, and afterwards I will go to live in the "Big Tepee" and sit down with the Shepherd Chief forever.

—Anonymous.

* * * *

Thinker speaks:

My own experience has been this: Over and over again when I have entered into the world of spirit through meditation, reaching out to the superhuman wisdom and power, I have found guidance and new vitality. Words that have altered my whole life have been spoken to me, in the inner world, as though by the voice of some heavenly messenger. Courage to face apparently insuperable difficulties has been given to me over and over again, triumphantly. Out of turmoil and doubt there have emerged enduring serenity and peace. Unfailing verification in actual experience has given me the knowledge that whatever my needs may be—for resources, protection, guidance or power—so long as I serve the Fraternity of the Spirit those needs will be met.

—Hornell Hart.

* * * *

And I will trust that He who heeds
The life that hides in mead and wold,
Who hangs yon alder's crimson beads,
And stains these mosses green and gold,
Will still, as He hath done, incline
His gracious care to me and mine;
Grant what we ask aright, from wrong debar,
And, as the earth grows dark, make brighter every star!

I have not seen, I may not see,
My hopes for man take form in fact,
But God will give the victory
In due time; in that faith I act.
And he who sees the future sure,
The baffling present may endure,
And bless, meanwhile, the unseen Hand that leads
The heart's desire beyond the halting step of deeds.

—John Greenleaf Whittier.

A RURAL EVENT

Following a custom of twenty-five years standing, Unadilla, New York, Meeting was host on September 25 to the entire township and outlying districts including the Central School of Unadilla. The occasion was the annual Rogers Hollow School Fair, which was held upon the church premises.

The church property is ideally equipped for such an event; the school exhibits being housed in the meeting-house, the products of shop, garden and farm finding space in the generously sized sheds, once used for horses and buggies, while poultry and pets were exhibited in the yard. Games and refreshments were served at the community house.

Observe all these activities and departments in vigorous action and you see a rural community and school fair, the like of which is hard to find. No admission fee has ever been charged and no questionable beverages or tobacco is ever sold. Speakers on topics related to school and farm are heard. A two or three day program is crowded into one day, for these rural folk are much too busy to devote more than that to such an enterprise. As many as seven hundred people have attended in some years, although the attendance was not so large this year because of transportation difficulties.

CONTRIBUTORS

LOWELL D. COX—Earlham '42. Just entering Gatlinburg C.P.S. Camp; Appointed by Indiana Yearly Meeting to the committee on revision of the Resolution.

MERLE L. DAVIS—Executive Secretary of Friends Board of Missions.

WILLIAM C. DENNIS — President of Earlham College.

HARROP A. FREEMAN — Clerk of the New York Yearly Meeting, Executive Secretary of the Pacifist Research Bureau.

MURRAY S. KENWORTHY — Executive Secretary of Indiana Yearly Meeting.

HOWARD E. KERSCHNER—Director International Commission for the Assistance of Child Refugees; Member Executive Committee, National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies; Director of Relief in Europe 1939-1942 for American Friends Service Committee.

DONALD MCKINNEY—Friends minister.

A. J. MUSTE — Associate Executive Director of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

E. MERRILL ROOT—Professor of English, Earlham College.

FLOYD SCHMOE—Member of staff of American Friends Service Committee office for Japanese-American relocation in Seattle, Washington.

PERCY M. THOMAS—Acting Secretary of the Executive Committee of the Five Years Meeting.

NORVAL WEBB—Pastor First Friends Meeting, Richmond, Indiana.

We must needs await God's time, but must be ready when it is ripe.

QUAKERDOM · AT · LARGE

Guilford College has just held its own campus community chest drive, combining four objects for which individual campaigns have been organized on the campus in previous years. A goal of $715 had been set for the undertaking, but within little more than twenty-four hours the students in charge of the drive had received contributions and pledges amounting to $815.45. The money will be divided among the American Friends Service Committee, the World Student Service, the Red Cross, and the community chest fund of the neighboring town of Greensboro.

* * * *

John Street, Penn '43, is taking graduate work at Haverford College and Frances Bondhus, Penn '43, is at Bryn Mawr College. They were the honor scholars in the 1943 graduating class.

* * * *

Alfred R. Stanley, Penn '30, son of C. V. Stanley, is employed in the research department of the Commercial Solvent Company, Terre Haute, Indiana. He is working with the production of Penicillin, the new wonder drug which is promising so much just now.

* * * *

Jeanette Hadley, Penn '29, and Emily Newlin, Penn '43, have been employed recently by the American Friends Service Committee in Philadelphia. Jeanette Hadley is secretary to Raymond Wilson while Emily Newlin is secretary to Guy Solt.

* * * *

Baltimore Young Friends Yearly Meeting *News Letter* reports the annual Labor Day Conference at Camp Keewadin as being one which proved to be very challenging to the young Friends who attended. The conference theme, "In the Nurture of Our Faith" was developed by the following speakers: Charles Thomas, Gilbert Kilpack, and Emily Parker Simon.

NEWS OF OUR MEETINGS

East Whittier, California, meeting reports a number of fall activities. The men's brotherhood observed family night with a basket supper. Following the business session Phillip Yung Lee, pastor of the Chinese Presbyterian church of Los Angeles, spoke delightfully. The Missionary Society reports several interesting meetings—a picnic in William Penn park; an open meeting in the church social hall, at which time Dr. Royal Dye, formerly a medical missionary in Africa under the Christian church, gave an impressive talk; and the October meeting held in the home of Josephine Jordan, with Mrs. Calvin Snyder, a former missionary to China, as guest speaker.

* * * *

Rally and Promotion Day for the Bible school was held in East Whittier Friends Meeting on September 26 with a unified service, during which children gave a program of songs and recitations. New Bibles were presented to three junior department children for memory work. East Whittier was well represented at Quaker Meadow Camp this summer by forty-one children and ten adults. The young people were also well represented at both the county and state Christian Endeavor conventions; several holding offices in the wider Christian Endeavor work. About thirty young boys and girls have been formed into a junior choir under the choir director. Special music for the October 10 worship service was provided by this group.

* * * *

The Young People's class of the Charlottesville, Indiana, Meeting, Walnut Ridge Quarterly Meeting, are sending a gift of a year's subscription for THE AMERICAN FRIEND to their members who are in the armed forces.

* * * *

A rally of Friends from surrounding Meetings was held October 3 in the historic Friends Meetinghouse at West Epping, New Hampshire. A basket lunch was enjoyed in the nearby pine grove and coffee was served by the West Epping Friends. At 3:00 o'clock Friends gathered in a Meeting for Worship which was a great inspiration to all present. Six Meetings were represented, there being Friends from Amesbury, Gonic, Dover, North Berwick, Lawrence, Exeter, and West Epping.

* * * *

Butternuts, New York, Quarterly Meeting was held at Unadilla, New York, October 16 and 17. All four of the local meetings were represented, although they are scattered over a wide area. Martin Thornton spoke earnestly and acceptably in the opening service. Since the Quarterly Meeting is strictly rural it was considered desirable to secure the attendance of someone who could speak authoritatively of the problems and needs of the rural church. Ralph Williamson of the Rural Institute, associated with Cornell University, spoke on "The Christ of the Countryside." Elizabeth Hazard, Yearly Meeting Secretary, was present to interpret the work of the Yearly Meeting and C. P. S.

An all day quarterly meeting missionary conference was held in the Friends church in Marshalltown, Iowa on October 13. The six meetings represented were Bangor, Liberty, Stanford LeGrand, Hartland and Marshalltown. The morning session was largely given over to a report of the General Missionary Conference of the Women's Missionary Union of Friends, which was held in the New Garden Meetinghouse Guilford College, N. C., in June. Mrs. Sarabell Sams of Arnold's Park, president of the Iowa Union, spoke very inspiringly on this. Following a basket dinner, the meeting was given over to the local societies. Orval H. Cox spoke on "Goals for Missionary Work." Jeanette Whealen of Hartford told of the beginning and early history of each society, and Mrs. Sams reviewed Iowa Yearly Meeting's plan for the Junior and Margaret Fell groups. A quiz on Jamaica was conducted by Martha Hadley of Le Grand.

* * * *

John R. Wright, quarterly meeting superintendent of Wichita, Kansas, quarter, and former pastor in Bangor quarterly meeting, spoke inspiringly in the Marshalltown Friends church in the Sunday evening service, September 12. He also visited Le Grand and Bangor meetings where he had formerly held pastorates. Marshalltown Friends Sunday school observed promotion and Rally Day under the new leadership of Alice Ellis, and are looking forward to a good year.

* * * *

Rally Day and Homecoming was observed at the Bluff Point Friends church Sunday, October 17. A special program of readings and singing in Sunday school was followed by the morning service at which Henry Gast was guest speaker. Following a carry in dinner, an afternoon service was held. The pastor, B. Orville Fisher, spoke on the Bible, and time was given over to singing, testimonies and special music. The services were well attended, and a Christian fellowship was felt throughout.

* * * *

On October 9 at Riverside church in New York City a First Day Conference was held. Dr. A. Brinton of Pendle Hill and Dr. Ivar Halstrom, assistant pastor of Riverside church spoke on the "Creative Teaching of Religion." Ardis Michener, Eleanor Webb and Florence Daniels of the Montclair Monthly Meeting, New Jersey, attended.

FIGS OR THISTLES

(Continued from page 430)

rphans, 13 million widows, 10 million efugees. Then, *practical* statesmen got ogether to make the peace—and no onsense about it. They punished and umiliated the aggressor, used the eague to serve their imperial interests, roke promises, failed to redress just rievances, and in general allowed so uch misery and ill-will to flourish that yrants sprouted like mushrooms.

Remember, too, the hard-boiled *practical* methods of world business: reparations, high tariffs, subsidized exporting, urrency manipulation, a greedy cornering of raw materials, and the control f markets and prices by cartelization—ll ending in a world wide economic am. And now, just twenty-five years ater, war again! They say that is eing practical! God pity us: if we ad deliberately conspired to wreck our world, I do not think we could have one the job better or with greater ispatch!

WHAT DID JESUS SAY?

It is time, then, we took Jesus at his word. We live in a moral universe where every act has its consequences and the wages of sin is death. As one modern wit has put it: "If you eat salt herring, even the Grace of God won't keep you from being thirsty." Jesus is not an idealist, but an anthropologist —a scientist who discovered the laws of life and gave them their clearest formulation. Just as we cannot defy the laws of nature or the laws of health and get away with it, so we cannot build a peaceful, prosperous and stable world-order upon immoral principles. Any sound international policy has got to be squared with the moral structure of life itself. If this involves a radical break with the old ways of doing things, we have no other choice. The old ways lead to murder.

Consider, by way of example, the simple matter of integrity. Everyone knows that nations will cheerfully enter into covenants promising not to make war on each other and to defend the territorial rights of the signatory powers. But everyone knows, also, that no nation can be trusted to honor its obligations *unless* its immediate and vital interests are at stake. When Stimson tried desperately to invoke the terms of the Peace Pact against Japan at the beginning, England refused to support the move. When Ethiopia appealed for justice, she was sent packing by Lord Halifax who said in effect that, in an imperfect world, principles should be suspended so that peace might prevail. That sort of thing is what makes for cynicism and suspicion the world over, and in the end—chaos. We can never build peace and security on the basis of duplicity.

The same holds good, too, in regard to vindictiveness. The old Roman heresy is gaining ground these days that severity produces peace. The world will be set to rights if only we are tough enough. It never works. There is only one way to conquer an enemy, and that is God's way: through suffering love to make a friend of him.

Still another necessary change in policy has to do with the whole sovereignty issue. Right now each nation is an irresponsible center of power. It claims the right to anything it pleases: to cut off access to its markets and products, tinker with the currency, erect tariff barriers, and to be the sole judge of its own cause. That in so doing it may adversely affect millions of people in other lands, or provoke a war, is irrelevant. It is a sovereign state. Such irresponsibility, of course, is thoroughly immoral; and because it is immoral, it doesn't work.

We have to establish a genuine world government and delegate enough of our national sovereignty to make it work. We've got to have an international police force, international control of money and banking and tariffs and immigration; and instead of the old system of imperialism and mandated colonies, with a single nation in charge of certain regions, international committees to supervise undeveloped territories and peoples. Idealistic? Not at all. It is "one world" that we live in.

REV. JAMES M. LICHLITER, Pastor, Emanuel Episcopal Church, Webster Groves, Missouri.

GOLDEN WEDDING ANNIVERSARIES

CAMPBELL — Josiah and Gertrude Campbell, pioneers of the East Whittier, California, church and community celebrated their fiftieth wedding aniversary, on October 3, at their home. Fifty guests registered in their guest book.

KENWORTHY—On October 10, Frank E. and Florence Kenworthy celebrated their golden wedding anniversary in East Whittier, California. Their daughters and daughter-in-law; Carolyn Hunnicutt and Louise Kenworthy of Whittier, and Lelia McClain of Garden Grove, were in charge.

MARRIAGES

CADBURY-DUDLEY — At Friends East Meetinghouse, Moorestown, New Jersey, on October 2, 1943, Anna Benajah Dudley and Benjamin Cadbury; both of Moorestown, New Jersey.

EVANS-NORTH — Josephine North to Robert Barrett Evans, son of Robert Barrett and Mary Johnson Evans, of First Friends, Indianapolis, Indiana, on October 2, 1943, at Decatur, Alabama.

HARVEY-SWANSON—Gloria Swanson to William Harvey, son of Glen and Lucy Harvey of Whittier, California, meeting at Yuma, Arizona.

MITCHELL-BUSH—Olga Bush to Walter E. Mitchell, son of Walter and Camille Mitchell of First Friends, Indianapolis, Indiana, on October 17, at Tabernacle Presbyterian Church.

SETTLE-JONES — Helen Ailene Jones, member of Illinois Grove Friends Church, and Kempton Lee Settle, member of Bangor Friends Church on September 8, in First Friends Church, Marshalltown, Iowa. Orval H. Cox, pastor, officiating.

DEATHS

BENEDICT — Emmer E. Benedict on September 25 at his home in Marshalltown, Iowa, at the age of eighty-two. He was a member of Friends church and served as trustee for many years. Survivors are his wife, Larissa; and two daughters, Jane Greene of La Plata, Maryland, and Mrs. Lyra Benedict of Des Moines. The pastor, Orval H. Cox, was in charge.

BESS—Stella Marie Bess, wife of Arthur L. Bess, on September 24, 1943, at Indianapolis, Indiana. She was a member of First Friends Meeting.

CAPLEY—Minnie Capley, at Whittier, California, August 26, 1943, a faithful member of East Whittier, Friends Church; Harley M. Moore conducted the services.

HITE—James H. Hite at Fort Banning, Georgia, on September 7, 1943. He was the husband of Gaynel McClain Hite. Services were held at the East Whittier, California, church with Harley M. Moore in charge.

HOLLAND — Elizabeth A. Holland, a birthright member of Somerton Friends Meeting, near Holland, Virginia, in her 93rd year. She was born September 14, 1850, and passed from this life May 31, 1943. She was the daughter of William H. and Anne Kennedy Hare and the widow of the late Z. Everett Holland. Surviving her are one son, Everett Holland of Spartenburg, S. C., and one daughter, Annie Holland of Holland, Virginia.

NEWLIN—John A. Newlin, at Madison, Wisconsin. He was the son of Charles O. and Sarah H. Newlin and was born in Plainfield, Indiana, on February 2, 1872. He had been at the head of the United States Forest Products Laboratory, being an authority on the design of wood aircraft. Burial was in Madison. Survivors are his widow, Anna; one daughter, Ruth; three sons, Charles, John and Benjamin; and a sister, Olive Lewellen of Plainfield.

REESE—Warren T. Reese of Albion, Iowa, on October 15, at the age of fifty-five. He was a member of First Friends of Marshalltown, Iowa. Services were conducted by his pastor, Orval H. Cox.

ROGERS—Winnie Rogers at her home near Rockdale, New York, October 10, at the age of sixty-eight. She was a member of Unadilla Meeting. She is survived by her husband, Smith Rogers.

YORK—Jared F. York at the home of his son in Hubbardsville, New York, aged eighty-four years. For sixty-three years he was an active member of West Brookfield Monthly Meeting—from the time of its inception.

WESTTOWN SCHOOL

Established 1799

Every child should have:

a. An opportunity for cooperative work and play.
b. Careful academic preparation as the basis for a future career.
c. Association with people who are striving to promote growth in the moral and spiritual realm.

Plan now for your own child's future education. For information about Westtown address JAMES F. WALKER, *Principal*, Westtown, Pennsylvania.

Nicholson Printing Co.

Founded 1870

Commercial Printing
Publications, Bookbinding
Printers of "The American Friend"

26, 28, 30 North Ninth Street
Richmond, Indiana

HAYDEN'S WHEAT GERM

Arthritis and constipation are keeping many Christian workers from being at their best. May we suggest Hayden's Caramelized Wheat Germ, rich in vitamins of the B-Complex. If your dealer does not handle, mail $1.00 direct to Hayden Flour Mills, Tecumseh, Mich., for four 10 ounce packages. Mention THE AMERICAN FRIEND.

WANTED

Assistant Dietitian to supervise student work program and keep cost records. Write to R. K. Tomlinson, Westtown School, Westtown, Pennsylvania.

LOCAL MEETING DIRECTORY

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

Friends Memorial Church, Fulton Street at Channing Way. Morning worship, 11 o'clock. Evening service, 7:45. Gorman Y. Doubleday, minister. Phone Thornwall 5370.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Boston Monthly Meeting, 5 Longfellow Park, Cambridge, (near Harvard Square). Meeting for worship First day at 11 a.m., jointly with Friends Meeting at Cambridge. Monthly business meeting second Fifth day of each month. George A. Selleck, Executive Secretary. Telephone TROwbridge 6883.

DETROIT, MICHIGAN

First Friends Church, Fullerton and Ohio Ave., in Noble School Bldg. Take Grand River car to Ohio, then two blocks north. Bible School, 10 a. m., Meeting for Worship, 11 a. m. Send names and addresses of people coming to Detroit to Dr. Bruce Douglas, 18066 Warrington Drive, Detroit, Michigan.

Friends Meeting, unprogrammed, at 11:00, each First Day, in Highland Park Y.W.C.A., Woodward at Winona. Visitors Phone Drexel 4801.

BROOKLYN, NEW YORK

Lafayette Avenue Meeting: Cor. Lafayette and Washington Avenues. Bible Classes 10:00 a.m., Divine Worship 11:00 a.m.; Thursday 6:30 p.m. Supper; Worship and Discussion 7:30 p.m. Robert M. Jones, Minister. Phone: MAin 2-8627.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Chicago Monthly Meeting, 110th Street and Longwood Drive. Bible School 10:30, Meeting 11:30. Rock Island Suburban Line to 111th Street. Halsted streetcar—"111th Sacramento," get off at Longwood Drive. Russell E. Rees, Minister, 2208 West 111th Street. Phone Cedarcrest 2715.

Evanston Meeting, Maple and Greenleaf, Evanston. One block east of Ridge Boulevard, two blocks north of Main Street. Bible School at ten; Meeting for Worship, eleven. Anne Willis, 1566 Oak Ave., Evanston, Illinois.

57th Street Meeting, 1174 East 57th Street, John Woolman Hall. Meeting for worship, 10:45; Religious Forum 11:30 a. m. E. Howard Marshall, 7131 S. Eberhart Avenue, Chicago. Phone Radcliffe, 1135. Alice B. Flitcraft, 515 Keystone Avenue, River Forest, Ill. Phone Forest 2824.

CINCINNATI, OHIO

Cincinnati Friends Meeting, Eden and Donahue Sts. Take either car 55 or 78 to University Ave., then walk east three blocks. Bible School, 9:45, and Meeting for Worship, 11 a. m. Burton S. W. Hill, 2803 Bellevue Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio.

DENVER, COLORADO

Friends Meeting, 4100 Shoshone St., Worship 11 a. m., Church School 9:45 a. m., Norman E. Young, Minister, 4146 Irving St. Tel. Gr. 4741.

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

First Friends Church, 13th at Alabama Street, Unified Service 10:30 a.m., Herbert Huffman, Minister. RIley 5224, office telephone.

LYNN, MASSACHUSETTS

Lynn Monthly Meeting, Silsbee and Friend Streets, near bus terminals and railway station. Only fourteen miles east of Boston. Meeting for worship 10:30 a. m., Bible school 12:00 m. Mid-week meeting Wednesday, 7:45 p. m. Arthur Santmier minister, 14 Berkshire Street, Swampscott, Mass. Lynn 5-2528.

The American Friend

Authorized by the Five Years Meeting of Friends in America

Published fortnightly by
THE FRIENDS PUBLICATION BOARD
101 South 8th Street, Richmond, Indiana

PERSONNEL OF THE BOARD

BUSINESS COUNCIL
Alvin T. Coate.....Indianapolis, Indian
Chairman of Council and Board
James C. Matchett.....Chicago, Illino
Vice-Chairman of Council and Board
Jesse O. Parshall.....Richmond, Indian
Secretary-Treasurer of Council and Board

EDITORIAL COUNCIL
Albert L. Copeland.....Knightstown, Indian
Chairman
J. Hoge Ricks.....Richmond, Virgini
Edgar H. Stranahan.....Minneapolis, Minneso

Subscription Price $1.50 per Year
Single Copies, 10 Cents
Foreign, 50 Cents Extra

Make all checks and money orders payable to Business Department
THE AMERICAN FRIEND
Richmond, Indiana

Address all correspondence having to do with the Editorial management of the paper to
EDITOR, AMERICAN FRIEND
Richmond, Indiana

Advertising rates given on application
Address Business Department

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Friends Church, 1st Avenue South at 14th Street. Bible School at 10 a. m. Meeting for Worship at 11 a. m. Edgar H. Stranahan, Minister, 111 West 45th Street, Phone Pl. 2960.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

The United Meetings for Worship of Twentieth Street and Fifteenth Street Meetings will be held at the Friends Meeting House, 221 East 15th Street, New York 3, N.Y., from October through April, Sunday at 11:00 a.m. Visitors welcome.

ROSEVILLE, CALIFORNIA

Citrus Heights Friends Church, Old Auburn Blvd., one-fourth mile off Highway 99 E between Sacramento and Roseville. Morning Sunday School at 10:00, Worship at 11:00. Evening Service, 7:30. T. Eugene Coffin, Minister. Phone Roseville, 356-F-11.

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

Friends Memorial Meeting, 23rd and East Spruce. Bible School, 10:00. Meeting for Worship, 11:00. Edward Wagenknecht, Minister. Phone Ev. 0649.

University Friends Meeting, 3959 15th Ave., N. E., Phone Melrose 7450. Religious discussion, 10:00 a. m. Meeting for Worship, 11:00 a. m.

WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Washington Monthly Meeting of Friends, affiliated with Five Years Meeting, 13th and Irving Streets, N. W. Meeting for Worship, 11 a.m. Visitors welcome.

Friends Meeting, 2111 Florida Ave., one block from Conn. Ave. Meeting for Worship First-day at 11 o'clock. First-day school at 9:45. Friends and others interested are cordially invited.

LOOKING AHEAD IN EDUCATION

The curriculum, life, and activities of a school prepare boys and girls for the tasks they will face after their secondary education. The proper integration of the mental, emotional, and physical growth of the student is a spiritual process.

George School's curriculum is studied constantly to make it fit new situations. While fundamental needs remain remarkably unchanged, continual adjustment is made to give greater balance in a world full of tremendous stresses.

Consultation at the school or inquiries by correspondence are invited.

For a catalogue and bulletins descriptive of the George School curriculum, write to:

GEORGE A. WALTON, *Principal*, Box 351, George School, Pa.

QUAKER EST. 1893 GEORGE SCHOOL COLLEGE PREPARATORY